APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/430,814	10/29/1999	PETER C BAHRS	AUS990339US5	7769

35525	7590	04/08/2004	

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N●●	Applicant(s)
	09/430,814	BAHRS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VAN H NGUYEN	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 January 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>124-144</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>124-144</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10</u> ✓

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　. Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to amendment C filed January 16, 2004.

2.   Claims 124-144 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 124-144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cataudella et al. (U.S. 6,275,232 B1).

5.   Cataudella is provided by Applicant in the IDS filed January 16, 2004.

6.   As to claim 124, Cataudella teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a

method in an object oriented data processing system for managing requests *(col.2, lines 3-50)*,

the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of:

        - sending a view event from a view controller object to an application mediator object

that created the view controller object, the view event describing an action on a container, the

container is handled by the view controller object *(col.6, line 64-col.7, line 4 and col.7, lines 51-54);*

- responsive to a receipt of the view event by the application mediator object, sending a request event from the application mediator object to a transporter object *(col.7, lines 59-67 and col.8, lines 32-44)*;

- receiving the request event at the transporter object *(col.9, lines 36-45 and col.10, lines 5-9)* the request event being self identifying by including within the request event a type and object data *(col.9, lines 36-58 and col.10, lines 31-36);*

- the plurality of destination objects not being included in the transporter object *(fig.4 and associated text);*and

- identifying, by the transporter object, the one of the plurality of destination objects using the request event; and sending the request event to the identified one of the plurality of destination objects destination object *(col.9, lines 36-58 and col.10, lines 5-18).*

Cataudella does not explicitly teach "a major code that identifies a class name of one of a plurality of destination objects, a minor code that identifies a method name to be invoked."

Cataudella, however, discloses *the event objects 426 are the passed along with event handling information (col.7, lines 51-58); if the event object pertains to the zooming view, then the target object is the view manager 410. However, if the event object pertains to a particular zooming object, then the target object is that zooming object. Preferably, the event object 426 includes a field which identifies the target. This field can be examined to identify the target, and can also be changed where the target changes (col.9, lines 27-49).*

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cataudella for "a major code that identifies a class name of one of a plurality of destination objects, a minor code that identifies a method name to be invoked" in order to provide means for efficiently distributing and handling events in the object oriented computing environment.

7.   As to claim 125, Cataudella teaches the one of the plurality of destination objects accesses a service *(col.8, lines 12-45)*.

8.   As to claim 126, Cataudella teaches the service is located on a remote data processing system *(col.4, lines 1-41)*.

9.   As to claim 127, Cataudella teaches formatting, by the one of the plurality of destination objects, the request event into a form that is recognizable by a destination *(col.9, lines 36-49)*.

10.   As to claim 128, Cataudella teaches the request event including an indication to access a service at a remote location; responsive to receiving the request event at the one of the plurality of destination objects, accessing the service at the remote location using the one of the plurality of destination objects; and formatting, by the one of the plurality of destination objects, the request event into a form that is recognizable by the remote location in order to access the service *(col.9, lines 27-58)*.

11.   As to claim 129, Cataudella teaches processing the request event by the service *(col.9, lines 5-30)*; receiving a response to the request event from the service after the service has processed the request event; formatting the response into a new request event; and returning the new request event to the transporter object *(col.10, lines 19-36)*.

12.   As to claim 130, Cataudella teaches the request event requesting data; and the new

request event including the requested data *(col.7, lines 51-67; col.9, lines 36-49; and col.10,*

lines 19-36).

13.   As to claim 131, Cataudella teaches the remote service is a database *(col.4, lines 1-41).*

14.   As to claim 132, the rejection of claim 124 above is incorporated herein in full. However,

claim 132 does not require *identifying the request event by including within the request event a*

type and object data.

15.   As to claim 133, note the discussion of claim 124 above for rejection of "the first

indication is a major code and the second indication is a minor code."

16.   As to claim 134, note the discussion of claim 124 above for rejection of "the major code

is a class name of the one of the plurality of destination objects and the minor code is a method

name that is to be invoked."

17.   As to claim 135, Cataudella teaches the request event includes data *(col.7, lines 51-67*

and col.9, lines 36-49).

18.   As to claims 136-143, note the rejection of claims 124-131 above. Claims 136-143 are

the same as claims 124-131, except claims 136-143 are system claims and claims 124-131 are

method claims.

19.   As to claim 144, note the rejection of claim 124 above. Claim 144 is the same as claim

124, except claim 144 is a computer program product claim and claim 124 is a method claim.

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's arguments filed on January 16, 2004 have been fully considered, but are

deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's

amendments.

Conclusion

21.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

     - Ahmed et al. (U.S. 6647432) teaches "Distributed framework for intertask

communication between workstation applications."

     - Herndon et al. (U.S. 6249290) teaches "Object oriented zooming graphical user

interface."

     - Berdahl (U.S. 5713045) teaches "System for processing user events with input device

entity associated with event producer which further links communication from event consumer to

the event producer."

22.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(x).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(x).

23.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final

action.

24.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The

examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

        The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100